DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 072 CG 030 171

AUTHOR	Pickens, David Miles
TITLE	Predicting Ministerial Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Research.
PUB DATE	2000-05-00
NOTE	65p.; Doctoral Research Paper, Biola University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Effectiveness; *Clergy; Interpersonal Relationship; *Job Performance; Job Satisfaction; *Leadership Responsibility; Literature Reviews; Personality Assessment; Personality Measures; Psychological Evaluation; Research Problems; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Minister Role

ABSTRACT

To comfort, educate, enlighten, and even entertain are some words used to describe the role of a minister, but how to determine a minister's effectiveness is a complicated task. The literature on what constitutes an effective minister can be described by four broad categories: the minister's personality, motivations and personal preferences, leadership, and interpersonal characteristics and perceptions. Input from psychologists in helping to determine the profile of who is suitable for the ministry increasingly is becoming more important. A summary of the pastors' motivations and personal preferences concludes that assessment should consider attitudes and behaviors related to conduct of the minister, rather than personality. In considering leadership style, several cited studies concurred that leadership skills predict ministerial effectiveness across the various functions. In the summary on interpersonal characteristics and perceptions, there were few correlations between ministers' self-ratings and parishioners' ratings. The paper concludes that effective ministry does not appear to be reducible to personality traits, or to patterns of motivation, leadership ability, or interpersonal relations. It notes that the evolving nature of the minister's job makes the task of understanding and promoting ministerial effectiveness a challenging task. (Contains 29 references.) (JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 072

PREDICTING MINISTERIAL EFFECTIVENESS: A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

A Doctoral Research Paper

Presented to

the Faculty of the Rosemead School of Psychology

Biola University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Psychology

---

by

David Miles Pickens

May, 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. PICKENS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CG030171

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREDICTING MINISTERIAL EFFECTIVENESS:

A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL

RESEARCH

by

David Miles Pickens

APPROVED:

Todd W. Hall, PhD — Date 5/17/00

Brian Misaka, PsyD — Date 5/17/00

APPROVED:

Patricia L. Pike, Dean

5/17/00

Date

Copyright © 2000 by David Miles Pickens

ABSTRACT

PREDICTING MINISTERIAL EFFECTIVENESS:

A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL

RESEARCH

by

David Miles Pickens

This paper reviews the empirical research related to the question: What constitutes an effective minister? The literature falls into four broad categories: the minister's personality, motivations and personal preferences, leadership, and interpersonal characteristics and perceptions. The research in each area is critically reviewed and summarized, and directions for future research are suggested.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

DOCTORAL RESEARCH PAPER

Introduction....1

Overview of Methodological Difficulties....4

Personality Functioning as a Predictor....5

Summary of Personality as an Effectiveness Predictor....15

Pastor's Motivations and Personal Preferences....17

Summary of Pastors' Motivations and Personal Preferences....25

Leadership....26

Leadership Styles and Behaviors....26

Leadership Skills....36

Summary of Leadership Styles and Behaviors and Leadership Skills....43

Interpersonal Characteristics and Perceptions....45

Summary of Interpersonal Characteristics and Perceptions....52

Discussion....53

REFERENCES....58

PREDICTING MINISTERIAL EFFECTIVENESS: A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Introduction

Then Jesus came to them and said, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age." (Matthew 28:18-20)

And so the disciples' "seminary" experience was complete. After 3 years with Christ, these eleven men, rough and tumble as they were, had certainly earned their Masters of Divinity degrees. Jesus, the expert regarding love and ministry spent 3 years training his disciples. They ate, slept, laughed, and cried with one another. They argued regarding social, emotional, and theological concerns. They even fought the "bad guys" (demons and Pharisees) together. As an aspiring psychologist, I am intrigued by Christ's method of training and more than a bit surprised at his selection of students. How did Christ determine that these were the men for the daunting task ahead? Was He able to assess the likelihood of their success prior to their selection? If so, upon what did He base such a decision? Intellect? Healthy personality functioning? Previous leadership experience? I have some reason

to doubt each of these possibilities: The disciples' inability to abandon their concrete thinking to grasp the big picture, their narcissistic traits and propensity towards impulsivity, and their less than adequate curriculum vitaes tend to refute the aforementioned grounds for selection. The selection of these men appears rather complex, too complex.

The temptation, therefore, is to give up. Yet, as early as the 1st century, the church has recognized the importance of critically accepting would-be ministers. In the 5th century, St. Benedict would not allow entrance to prospective ministers unless they persisted "with patience the insults inflicted upon them" as they knocked at the monastery door for 5 days (Kling, 1958). Early church leaders obviously recognized the importance of eliminating spurious ministerial candidates. And as we have experienced in recent decades, the spiritual, emotional, and financial toll of a "false brother" can leave a church reeling for years. The local church and the denomination at large bear the responsibility of properly training and screening potential ministers. As the church, we are charged to both protect and edify the young in Christ while also practicing good stewardship. Carefully considering those we train and send as ministers is critical.

Increasingly, since the 1930s, the church has called upon psychologists to assist in determining those most suited for the ministry. Yet, delimiting the minister's responsibilities and daily activities is a difficult task. As the saying goes, "A minister must be ready to preach, pray, or die in a moments notice!"

But there is more. He or she is also called upon to comfort and chasten. They rejoice with newly-weds while containing the anger and hurt of numerous estranged couples. As a chaplain, he or she must minister to the sick and dying while simultaneously celebrating with proud new parents. Behind the pulpit, he or she is expected to deliver a message that convicts, comforts, educates, enlightens, and even entertains a diversified crowd. He or she is the C.E.O, the "hire-fire guy," the administrator, the visionary, the disciplinarian, the spiritual leader, the counselor, the grounds crew, the maintenance man, ad infinitum. He or she serves as a visible reminder of the One who transcends our finite limitations. This eight lettered word, minister, encapsulates so much. With such a vast array of responsibilities, roles, denominations, and church sizes, it becomes difficult for the psychologist to identify which skills, abilities, and personality characteristics foster effective ministry. Additionally, churches are not simply interested in a "capable" minister; their desire, rather, is an "effective" minister.

The purpose of this paper is to review the empirical research related to the question: What constitutes an effective minister? Journal articles and dissertations empirically investigating the effectiveness of ministers were reviewed. Studies regarding the personal functioning of pastors were excluded as they have been reviewed elsewhere (Hall, 1997). The PsychLit- and Dissertation Abstracts International databases for the years 1974 to the present were searched. Reference sections of articles and dissertations

obtained were also searched for relevant articles. The literature falls into four broad categories, overlapping to some degree, but differing in focus: the minister's personality, motivations and personal preferences, leadership, and interpersonal characteristics and perceptions. Prior to reviewing these three areas, a brief overview of the methodological difficulties regarding this research will be addressed.

Overview of Methodological Difficulties

Increasingly, over the last 30 years, the prediction of ministerial effectiveness, rather than the simple elimination of neurotic seminary candidates, has become the central task required of psychologists working with this population. With time and the benefit of trial and error, the church has become progressively more precise in its requests of the psychologist. Fortunately, psychologists have also become more adept in their approach to this issue.

While psychologists like Nauss and Malony have led the way in refining testing procedures for ministerial candidates, other psychologists still fall prey to the same procedural problems described by Dittes (1962) almost four decades ago:

> Far more frequently than not, measurements have been made simply because the measuring instruments were available . . . . To measure effectiveness, grade point average in seminary or size of congregation or budget are still temptingly available indices when more obviously valid indices require difficult definitional labor. To discover predictors of effectiveness, existing personality tests - all neatly standardized and reliable - are temptingly available, even

when there is no conceivable basis for supposing that they measure anything that goes into becoming an effective minister. (pp. 144-145)

Although several of the subsequent studies use grade point average and predetermined psychological measures to assess effectiveness, most of the authors have sought more valid criteria. Unfortunately, however, a consistent thread weaving throughout these studies is the attempt to correlate numbers with effectiveness. In other words, an increase in certain church statistics is viewed as representing effectiveness. Kierkegaard (1854) recognized this sub-Christian tendency years ago as he queried, "The disciple who became a fisher of men cast out his net and in one haul caught 3,000 souls-the Master during his whole lifetime caught only 12. Is the disciple greater than the master, then?" (p. 335). Though it is rather easy to answer "No!" regarding Christ's ministerial effectiveness, it seems more difficult to apply the same presuppositions to our present-day ministers.

Personality Functioning as a Predictor

In an attempt to ascertain the utility of psychological assessments in predicting ministerial effectiveness, Malony and Majovski (1986) borrowed Nauss' (1972) distinction between primary effectiveness and secondary effectiveness in their investigation of 87, full time United Methodist ministers from the Pacific-Southwest Conference. Primary effectiveness refers to specific observable behaviors, whereas the latter has more to do with consequences of the pastor's leadership (Nauss, 1972). Malony and Majovski

used the Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI) to asses the minister's primary effectiveness. This measure will be described in some length shortly as it is commonly used throughout the studies reviewed here. The MEI was mailed to the pastor, the District Superintendent (DS), and the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee (PPRC). The PPRC are members of the local church who work closely with the minister regarding the life of the church. Secondary effectiveness was determined by the percent change of the following variables: membership, attendance, church school, salary, and giving (Malony & Majovski, 1986).

The eight factors that comprise the MEI were considered to be the most salient dimensions emerging from a study conducted by Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke (1980). Schuller et al. polled 5,000 laity and clergy from 47 denominations to gather 850 descriptions of ministry. From these descriptions, they were able to factor out the following 11 areas that contribute to ministerial effectiveness: (a) having an open, affirming style; (b) caring for persons under stress; (c) evidencing congregational leadership; (d) being a theologian in life and thought; (e) undertaking ministry from a personal commitment of faith; (f) developing fellowship and worship; (g) having denominational awareness; (h) not having disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics; (i) evidencing ministry to community and world; (j) being priestly-sacramental in ministry; (k) and manifesting a lack of privatistic, legalistic style. The 11 factors have been organized into the Profiles of

Ministry (POM) inventory, whereas the first eight categories comprise the 59-item MEI used in the present study. Each rater was asked to respond to the following question: "How characteristic is this [item] of your minister?" or ". . . . of you?" (Malony & Majovski, 1986).

Each minister included in this study had, previous to ordination and prior to this study, undergone a psychological evaluation consisting of the MMPI and the Inventory of Religious Activities and Interests (IRAI), which assesses the minister's preference for performing 10 ministerial roles: counselor, administrator, teacher, scholar, evangelist, spiritual guide, preacher, reformer, priest, and musician. The psychologist serving as the psychological evaluator (PE) chose these instruments as he theorized that "greater normalcy" and "higher overall interest in ministerial roles" would correlate with effectiveness (Malony & Majovski, 1986). Based on these measures, but primarily the MMPI, the PE would recommend that the minister be either "accepted or rejected without condition" for ordination or he would recommend that the minister be "accepted or deferred" with a list of qualifications.

When the PE's recommendations were compared to the measures of effectiveness, no significant correlations were found with either primary effectiveness (MEI) or secondary effectiveness. Since the PE had originally conducted his assessment to screen the ministerial candidates, he was asked to review his assessments and then place each candidate into a normal distribution category of those most and least likely to succeed: 64% rated as

likely, 14% as more likely, 14% as less likely, 4% as most likely, and 4% as least likely to succeed. Once again, correlational analysis revealed no significant relationships between the measures of effectiveness and the psychologist's recommendations.

Interestingly, however, a multiple regression analysis of primary effectiveness and the MMPI revealed the following negative predictors on the MMPI: 8% of the variance of the Pastor-PPRC ratings were accounted for by the Mania (Ma) scale ($\underline{R} = -0.29$, $\underline{F} = 4.000$, $\underline{df} = 1,91$, $\underline{p} < .05$) and 11% of the variance of the pastor's own ratings were accounted for by the Psychopathic Deviant (PD) scale ($\underline{R} = -.33$, $\underline{F} = 7.87$, $\underline{df} = 1,91$, $\underline{p} < .01$).

Regarding secondary effectiveness, the Social Introversion (Si) scale accounted for 7% of the variance on the attendance variable ($\underline{R} = 0.27$, $\underline{F} = 4.81$, $\underline{df} = 1,91$, $\underline{p} < .05$). It was also noted that the DS and PPRC ratings were significantly positively related to three secondary measures: membership, attendance, and church school. This finding suggests that church members and DSs tend to evaluate effectiveness based on "people participation."

Based on the assumption that "personality enters decisively into effectiveness in any vocation dealing with people," Sue Webb Cardwell (1967, p. 4) hypothesized that the MMPI would measure some of the personality variables that predict an effective minister. Towards this end, Cardwell hoped to find whether special MMPI norms were needed for Protestant seminary students and whether certain MMPI scales, or combinations thereof, could

predict ministerial effectiveness.

Cardwell used the MMPI scores of 76 students who began attending Christian Theological Seminary (CTS) during 1963 and 1964. The means of the CTS student's scales exceeded the general population's means on all scales with the sole exception being Social Introversion (Si). The Hysteria (Hy), Psychopathic Deviate (Pd), Paranoia (Pa), Psychasthenia (Pt), Schizophrenia (Sc), and Mania (Ma) scales were more than half a standard deviation above the mean. The validity index, K, was likewise elevated. Moreover, it is likely that 20% of the CTS students' Masculinity-Femininity (Mf) scales would exceed 98% of the population. Cardwell concluded that special norms are warranted for the CTS population as their norms are sufficiently unique when compared to the general population. Cardwell then compared the CTS norms to two other Protestant seminaries of different regions and found very little difference. According to Cardwell's data, it does not appear necessary to create special norms for each specific seminary, but rather one set of norms which would generalize to other Protestant seminaries. However, Cardwell's data is now more than 30 years old and may differ from current seminary norms.

In an attempt to assess the predictive validity of the MMPI, Cardwell averaged the Grade Point Averages (GPA) of each student for two semesters and used this as the criterion for effectiveness. The student was also rated on the Ministerial Effectiveness Scale (MES) by three faculty members and three

fellow students. These scores were then averaged. Only two scales, Mf (r = .36, $p < .02$) and Originality (r = .29, $p < .05$), significantly correlated with GPA. Ma (with K correction) significantly correlated with peer ratings at the .02 level (r = .34). Peer ratings nearly correlated at the .05 level with GPA and intelligence, suggesting that fellow seminarians are impressed with high energy and ambition level, classroom performance, and verbal intelligence. Faculty ratings were correlated with Ma and "Control" of the MMPI at the .05 level (r = .30 and r = .32, respectively) and with GPA and peer ratings at the .02 level (r = .36 and r = .34, respectively). Additionally, near significant correlations were noted with Dominance (Do), the Language Factor of the California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM), and (negatively) with Pa. These findings suggest that faculty were also impressed with high energy and ambition level, intelligence, leadership, and classroom performance. Moreover, they were negatively influenced by hypersensitivity and suspiciousness.

Four equations, utilizing various scales from the MMPI and the CTMM Language Factor, were tested to see if they could predict GPA, which was the criterion for effectiveness in this study. The following combinations resulted in prediction of students GPA at the .02 level: (a) The Masculinity-Femininity (Mf), Ego Strength (Es), and Schizophrenia + Validity (Sc + K) scales combined to account for a total of 30% of the variance of GPA; (b) combining the experimental scales Originality (Or), Role Playing (Rp), and Ego Strength (Es) accounted for 27% of the variance of GPA; (c) combining (Mf) and the

CTMM Language Factor accounted for a total of 29% of the variance of the criterion; (d) the CTMM LF alone was also capable of predicting GPA. Again, however, the reader will want to note that the aforementioned combinations predict only GPA. Cardwell is making the assumption that success in seminary (as defined by GPA) equates with ministerial effectiveness.

Fifteen years after the aforementioned study, Cardwell (1982) once again used the data available at CTS to assess which psychological factors contribute to women's effectiveness, or lack thereof, in ministry. Thirty women who began their studies at CTS between the years of 1962 and 1976 were placed into one of two categories: (a) "those clearly successful" and (b) "those either having failed and having moved into another occupation because of lack of success, or those still in ministry experiencing little/less success" (p. 154). Unfortunately, the sole determinant for their placement in either group was the subjective opinion of the Director of Field Education at CTS since 1958.

Each woman had completed the MMPI, the Theological School Inventory (TSI), and the Adjective Check List during her senior year of seminary. To compliment the battery, the student's CTMM score from her first year of seminary was also added to the data.

Results indicated that the successful women ministers were more intelligent than their less successful counterparts. Although their Total Mental Factors did not reach significant discrepancy (119.4 vs. 114.7), the successful

group's Language Factor was significantly higher at the .05 level (127.67 vs. 119.80). Cardwell noted, "This means their verbal ability is significantly greater - and the ministry is a verbal profession!" (p. 155). It was observed that 3 subjects from the less successful group scored above 130, which led the author to conclude that, although intelligence is an important variable in ministerial effectiveness, it is not sufficient.

The minister's self-image was assessed by the administration of the Adjective Check List which is comprised of 300 adjectives. The subject checks the adjectives that are self-descriptive. Three scales demonstrated a significant difference between the two groups: personal adjustment ($p < .02$), heterosexuality ($p < .02$), and affiliation ($p < .02$). On the personal adjustment scale, the more successful ones tended to endorse the following items: optimism, cheerfulness, interest in others, a readiness to adapt, dependable, peaceable, trusting, friendly, practical, loyal, wholesome, tend to fit in well, ask for little help, treat others with courtesy, and work enterprisingly towards their own goals. Lower scorers tended to be at odds with other people, moody, and dissatisfied. The effective ministers also derive more emotional satisfaction from interactions with peers of the opposite sex. Juxtaposed to the successful ministers' interest in life and experience in a healthy, direct and outgoing manner was the less effective ministers' tendency to think too much, dampen vitality, be dispirited, inhibited, shrewd and calculating in interpersonal relationships. In relation to Need Affiliation, the more successful ministers

perceived themselves as adaptable, anxious to please, ambitious, and concerned with position whereas the less effective group tended to see themselves as more individualistic, less trusting, more pessimistic, and restless in prolonged contacts with others (Cardwell, 1982, p. 156).

The MMPI data revealed that the more successful women scored significantly lower on the Conscious repression (R) scale (.01), the Lie (L) scale (.05), and significantly higher on the Control (Cn) scale (.02). The R scale revealed that the less successful women ministers used rationalization and denial, rather than awareness and insight, to cope with problems. The L scale indicated that these women attempted to present themselves as more virtuous, conforming, and self-controlled, whereas the more successful women were significantly more relaxed and willing to admit general human faults. The Cn scale indicated that the effective women were more able to control their problem behavior. They also benefited from more realistic self-appraisal.

Cardwell (1982) optimistically concluded that most of the aforementioned traits can be distilled into characteristics that the individual can improve upon. She suggested counseling, assertiveness training, and group work to assist ministerial trainees in personal growth.

In a rather complex and thorough study, Stewart (1990) attempted to assess each of the substantive categories delineated in this paper: personality factors, motivation, and leadership styles. He hypothesized that the following personality predictors would be related to effectiveness: interpersonal warmth,

extroversion, and emotional adjustment. He also speculated that motivation based on desire for evangelism, natural leading, definiteness of decision, higher concern for structure and lower interest in academia would be indicative of effective ministry, and that supportive leadership style would highly correlate with effectiveness. Lastly, he suggested that "highly desirable personal characteristics" as indicated by scores from the Profile of Ministry Casebook (POM), would be related to effectiveness (Stewart, 1990). Only his hypothesis regarding personality factors will be discussed here. The other hypotheses will be addressed in their corresponding sections.

Stewart used 54 students enrolled in a 9-month parish ministry internship from 1988-1989 at Fuller Theological Seminary as his sample. He utilized four tests to serve as his predictor variables: The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire-Form A (16 PF), the Theological School Inventory-Form D (TSI), the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), and the Profile of Ministry Casebook (POM). To assess effectiveness of the interns, Stewart used the Ministry Task Rating (MTR) and the Intern Evaluation Form (IEF). Each of these tests will be described here with the exceptions of the POM, the LOQ, and the TSI as they are reviewed elsewhere.

The MTR is a form completed during the intern's final evaluation. It is completed by ordained clergy who serve as the student's supervisors. It consists of rating six areas of ministry: leadership in worship, education, pastoral care, evangelism and mission, administration, and financial

management. Stewart developed the IEF based on the criteria considered to be important in ministry as revealed by Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke's (1980) research. He devised a 66-item measure which organized Schuller et al.'s, work into seven dimensions of ministry: interpersonal style, caring of persons in stress, faith commitment, emotional maturity, leadership, development of fellowship and worship, and ministry to community and world.

The 16PF is a 187-item self-report inventory, which was used to assess the interns' personality characteristics. The 16 scales reveal bipolar dimensions of personality. The correlational analysis of the 16PF did not support the hypothesis that interpersonal warmth, extroversion, and emotional adjustment predict effectiveness. It was noted, however, that abstract reasoning was positively correlated ($r = .28$, $p < .04$) with effectiveness (MTR), and lower sensitivity approached a significant correlation with effectiveness ($r = -.25$, $p < .06$ and $r = -.25$, $p < .07$, on MTR and IEF, respectively). A multiple regression analyses indicated that these factors, combined with conscientiousness and social boldness, accounted for a significant amount of the variance of the MTR ($R^2 = .15$, $p < .005$).

Summary of Personality as an Effectiveness Predictor

These four studies utilized the MMPI, the Adjective Check List, and the 16PF to assess the predictive validity of personality measures. Cardwell (1967) called for special seminarian norms as she found that ministerial students tend to score higher than the general population on the MMPI.

Using GPA as her effectiveness criterion, Cardwell (1967) found that Mf and the experimental scale Or were able to predict effectiveness. Cardwell (1982) later found effective female ministers to be more relaxed and realistic in their self-appraisal. They are also able to admit their short-comings and refrain from acting out problem behaviors. Using the Adjective Check List, Cardwell (1982) also found that effective women ministers tended to be more optimistic, adaptable, friendly, loyal, sociable, spontaneous, out-going and anxious to please whereas less effective ministers were moody, dissatisfied, dispirited, inhibited, less trusting and more pessimistic.

Lastly, Stewart (1990) used the 16PF to test his hypothesis that interpersonal warmth, extroversion, and emotional adjustment would predict effectiveness defined by supervisors' ratings on the Ministry Task Rating (MTR) and the Intern Evaluation Form (IEF). Although his findings did not support his hypothesis, he did find abstract reasoning to be significantly correlated with effectiveness. Furthermore, combining the personality traits of abstract reasoning, lower sensitivity, conscientiousness, and social boldness accounted for a significant amount of the variance on the MTR.

Although there are several significant findings evidenced in these studies, using personality as a predictor of effectiveness appears to lack conclusive support. Cardwell (1982) found evidence that general emotional adjustment predicts effectiveness whereas Stewart (1990) did not. This finding certainly parallels the accounts in Scripture. Throughout the Old and

New Testaments, God apparently delights in choosing those with conspicuous personality flaws and weaknesses. Personality measures alone, then, are likely less than adequate for the task of predicting ministerial effectiveness.

Pastors' Motivations and Personal Preferences

Lichtman (1989) surveyed eight newly appointed senior ministers in the California-Pacific Conference of the United Methodist Church, hoping to determine whether a minister's personal performance preferences or a church's expectations would better predict effectiveness. The Job-Person-Match (JPM) was used to assess job expectancies and personal preferences. It is comprised of two Likert-type inventories: (a) the Personal Preference Inventory (PPI), which measures the performance preferences of the minister, and (b) the Job Perception Inventory (JPI), which measures job expectancies. The Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI) was used to measure ministerial effectiveness.

The ministers completed the JPM in August, 1988. The members of the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee (PPRC) completed the JPI and the MEI in March, 1989, and previously gathered data regarding the job expectancies of denominational leadership was used. Five comparisons were made between: (a) the PPRC's job expectancy and the minister's preference profiles, (b) the PPRC's job expectancy and the minister's job expectancy profiles, (c) the PPRC's expectancy profile and an expectancy profile generated by denominational leaders, (d) the denominational leaders' expectancy and the

minister's preference profiles, and (e) the minister's preference and the minister's expectancy profiles.

No significant differences were noted for three of the above comparisons: (a) the PPRC's JPI and the minister's PPI, (c) the PPRC's expectancy profile and an expectancy profile generated by denominational leaders, and (e) the minister's PPI and the minister's JPI. A significant positive correlation, however, was noted between the number of matches between the PPRC's expectancies (JPI) and the minister's expectancies (JPI), and effectiveness (MEI; $r = .79$, $p < .03$). Thus, as the church's job expectancies and the minister's job expectancies are increasingly similar, the greater the perceived effectiveness of the minister.

Surprisingly, a significant positive correlation was found between the discrepancy between the minister's preferences (PPI) and the denominational leadership's expectancies (JPI), and effectiveness (MEI; $r = .763$, $p < .05$). Thus, as the degree of discrepancy between the expectations of the denominational leaders and the preferences of the minister increases, the higher the congregation rated the minister's effectiveness. Lichtman (1989) suggested that these ministers learned how to function effectively within their denomination even though their personal preferences differed from the denominational expectancies.

In one of Nauss' (1983) earliest studies, he compared ministerial effectiveness with various measures of motivation. Based upon the

recommendations of Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) District Presidents, Nauss selected 66, male ministers as his effective group. Each minister completed the Ministerial Function Scale (MFS), the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), a demographic survey, and an 11-point measure of positiveness and optimism. The latter scale requires the minister to rate the present spiritual development of his congregation and the expected development following 5 years of service. He also rated his personal development for the same two periods of time. Each minister's effectiveness (MFS) was also rated by key position holders within the church.

The MFS is a 5-point, Likert-type scale (5 = Outstanding, 1 = Ineffective) comprised of 30 items, which load on six different ministry functions. A sampling of the "Preacher-Priest" factor includes preaching sermons, leading public worship and working with congregational boards. "Community and Social Involvement" refers to participation in community organizations and giving assistance to victims of social neglect. The "Administrator" factor includes managing the church office and church finances and planning strategy and programs. "Personal and Spiritual Development" is described by the pastor maintaining a disciplined life of prayer and personal devotion, following a definite schedule of reading and study, and cultivating home and personal life. The "Visitor-Counselor" function includes visiting members and new residents, counseling with people, fostering fellowship, and recruiting and training lay leaders. The sixth

function, "Teacher," includes teaching and working directly with children and with young people. Nauss added a seventh function, "Evangelist," which refers to being active in evangelism, setting membership goals, and promoting missions in the community.

The JDS assesses five general areas: (a) "Motivation Potential" is determined by the pastor's perceptions of six job dimensions: the variety of skills required in the work, the impact of the job on the lives of people, feedback about effectiveness from work results and parishioners, and the degree of autonomy or freedom allowed on the job; (b) "Internal Motivation" is the degree to which the pastor is self-motivated; (c) "Growth Need Strength" assesses the extent to which one responds to a complex, challenging job and the extent to which he finds his work meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile; (d) "Feedback" is determined by both feedback from the job itself and from others; (e) "Satisfaction" is measured by satisfaction with the work-pay, security, social opportunities, supervisory relationships, and personal growth. Most of these functions were assessed on a 7-point scale.

The average of each function was obtained for the group of effective ministers. Any pastor that scored above this mean by one-half standard deviation was considered effective in that specific function. These scores were then compared to a general group of 175 LC-MS ministers on the six scales of the MFS. Nauss added a seventh scale, "The Overall Effective Profile," which was comprised of ministers who scored above the group mean

in at least five of the six MFS functions. The following paragraphs report significant differences between the means of the general group of ministers and the effective group of ministers.

Results for the Priest and Preacher profile revealed that these ministers possess a high level of motivation that results from numerous job dimensions. These pastors are motivated by the skill variety required of them ($p < .01$), the significance of their duties ($p < .05$), the feedback they receive from others ($p < .05$) and their job ($p < .01$), their own internal sense of a calling ($p < .05$), and the complexity of their work ($p < .05$). They tend to be satisfied with their pay ($p < .01$), the social opportunities ($p < .01$) and supervisory relationships ($p < .001$) afforded them, and their own personal growth ($p < .001$). They are also positive about the present spiritual development of their congregation ($p < .001$) and their person ($p < .05$), and they anticipate continued success for their congregation ($p < .01$).

Ministers considered effective regarding Community and Social Involvement also derive motivation from the skill variety ($p < .05$) and significance of their particular function ($p < .05$), the feedback they receive from others ($p < .01$) and their job ($p < .05$), and the challenges of their work ($p < .05$). Likewise, they too are satisfied with the social opportunities ($p < .01$), supervisory relationships ($p < .001$), and personal growth ($p < .001$) provided by their work. These pastors feel positively about their spiritual development ($p < .001$) and that of their congregations ($p < .001$). They anticipate the

future to be equally as positive for them ($p < .001$) and their congregation ($p < .01$).

The effective Administrator relies primarily on feedback from their work ($p < .05$) and others ($p < .01$) to fuel their motivation. They are satisfied with their pay ($p < .001$), supervisory relationships ($p < .001$), and personal growth ($p < .001$). They feel positively about the present spiritual development ($p < .001$) and the future ($p < .01$) state of their congregation's development.

The Personal and Spiritual Development profile reveals that effective ministers in this realm derive their motivation from the variety of skills required of them ($p < .05$), the feedback they receive from others ($p < .001$), their own internal calling ($p < .01$), the challenges they face ($p < .05$), and their perception of their work as meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile ($p < .05$). They are satisfied with their pay ($p < .001$), social opportunities ($p < .05$), supervisory relationships ($p < .001$), and personal growth ($p < .001$). They are presently very positive with regard to their personal spiritual development ($p < .001$), their congregation's spiritual development ($p < .001$), and they tend to hold this same level of optimism for the future ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively).

Nauss (1983) postulated that the Visitor-Counselor function may be more demanding or comprehensive than the other functions as effectiveness involves numerous motivations. These ministers perceive their work as requiring a variety of skills ($p < .001$) and are willing to use feedback from their

work ($p < .01$) and others ($p < .001$). They are self-motivated ($p < .05$) and perceive their work as meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile ($p < .05$). They are generally satisfied with their work ($p < .05$), and specifically with their pay ($p < .001$), social opportunities ($p < .001$), supervisory relationships ($p < .001$), and personal growth ($p < .001$). They tend to remain four years longer in their first parish than other pastors ($p < .05$) and are positive regarding the present ($p < .01$) and future ($p < .01$) spiritual development of their congregations and the present state of their personal development ($p < .05$).

The Teacher Profile revealed that these ministers are motivated by skill variety ($p < .05$). Moreover, they are satisfied with their pay ($p < .05$), supervisory relationships ($p < .001$), and personal growth ($p < .001$) provided by their position. The teacher is also positive about the present ($p < .01$) and future ($p < .001$) spiritual development of their congregation. Nauss concluded that the measures used in this study were not adequate in identifying a primary motivational characteristic for the teaching pastor.

The Overall Effective profile revealed that these ministers are motivated by skill variety ($p < .05$), task significance ($p < .01$), feedback from others ($p < .05$) and their job ($p < .01$), and the challenge of their work ($p < .001$). The overall effective minister is satisfied in general ($p < .05$) and specifically with their pay ($p < .001$), social opportunities ($p < .05$), supervisory relationships ($p < .001$), and personal growth ($p < .001$). This pastor is very positive about the present ($p < .001$) and future ($p < .001$) spiritual development of their

congregation. Likewise, they are positive regarding their present ($p < .001$) development, as well as, their anticipated future ($p < .05$) development.

In a study described earlier, Cardwell (1982) used the Theological School Inventory (TSI), which is a 165-item tool that measures the relative strength of various motivations for ministry. It produces seven scales describing the student's motivation, five scales that tap the various aspects of the student's decision to pursue ministry, and a wealth of information regarding the student's background. No significant differences were noted with regard to motivation for ministry as measured by the TSI. The successful ministers did tend, however, to express more confidence in their leadership ability. They were also less conservative and more flexible and open to new ideas.

In Stewart's (1990) previously described study, he hypothesized that motivation based on desire for evangelism, natural leading, definiteness of decision, and structure in belief would be indicative of effective ministry. Although this hypothesis was not supported, the TSI scale Intellectual Concern was found to reveal a significant positive correlation with effectiveness (MTR; $r = .37$, $p < .01$), which suggests that one's desire for intellectual pursuits is associated with effectiveness.

Summary of Pastor's Motivations and Personal Preferences

The authors of these studies hoped to determine how a minister's motivations and/or personal preferences might impact effectiveness. Lichtman (1989) compared the minister's personal preferences and expectancies with the expectancies of the local church leaders and the leaders of the denomination at large. As expected, he found perceived ministerial effectiveness to increase as the minister's and local church expectancies were increasingly similar. An unexpected correlation indicated that congregations rated their ministers as more effective as the discrepancy between the expectations of the denominational leaders and the preferences of the minister increased.

Nauss (1983) categorized effective ministers into seven ministry functions and then assessed the levels and styles of motivation for each function. Effective Priest and Preachers tend to be optimistic and perceive their parish as a challenge. Similarly, the Community and Social Involvement profile reveals that these effective ministers are optimistic and perceive their work as complex and significant. Administrators are positive and rely on feedback to succeed in their work. The Personal and Spiritual Development profile indicates that these ministers are likewise positive, but also glean motivation from their own person.

The Visitor-Counselor is self-confident, motivated, and satisfied with their place in life. Although not significantly so, the Administrator tends to be positive and satisfied, deriving motivation from their work. Lastly, the Overall

Effective profile reveals that these effective ministers possess nearly all of the characteristics.

Both Cardwell (1982) and Stewart (1990) used the TSI hoping to find motivational predictors of effectiveness. Although Cardwell's findings lacked significance, she did note that effective ministers tend to be more confident of their leadership ability, less conservative, and more flexible. Stewart found ministers that desire intellectual pursuits to be perceived as more effective.

Leadership

Ministers are called upon to shepherd or lead the church. Unlike other professions, however, the minister's job description is not clearly defined. The parameters appear all inclusive as each parishioner has different needs and expectations. Nonetheless, it is essential that the effective minister lead. Researchers have initiated studies comparing effectiveness and leadership in an effort to understand which leadership styles, behaviors, and skills are required of effective ministers in their various roles. This research will be divided into two leadership categories: (a) leadership styles and behaviors, and (b) leadership skills.

Leadership Styles and Behaviors

Cochran (1982) set out to identify and analyze which leadership behaviors seemed to indicate and describe an effective United Methodist minister. He utilized a stratified random sampling procedure to ensure that

urban, suburban, and rural churches were equally represented. He sent 370 questionnaires to 37 churches; the pastor completed one as did 9 members of the administrative board. Fourteen ministers and 59 lay members returned their questionnaires prior to the cut-off date. Using John C. Flanagan's Critical Incident Technique (CIT), the returned questionnaires generated 204 critical elements or specific behaviors which were then placed in one of seven role categories describing ministry, based on their conceptual fit: administrator, organizer, pastor, preacher, priest, teacher, and reactor. The effective behaviors will be listed under the role-performance categories in which they fall.

Effective administrators: (a) shared ideas with their congregation about program planning and development in the local church; (b) were enthusiastic about the programs that existed in the church; (c) served as an advocate for certain groups within the church without alienating other groups; (d) were sensitive to people's involvement in the life of the church and avoided taking action that affected other individuals before informing them; (e) respected the parishioners' time and schedules and carried out business efficiently so as to avoid prolonged meetings and the unnecessary scheduling of additional ones; (f) maintained professional respect for colleagues and, when possible, negotiated on-going commitments made by their predecessor.

Effective organizers: (a) encouraged the development of programs in the local church and trained persons to become leaders of these programs; (b) were able to plan and implement interest groups within the church and

enabled these groups and organizations to work together; (c) participated in some activities of the local church in addition to initiating and developing them; (d) planned and implemented ecumenically oriented programs.

Effective pastors: (a) related well with people; (b) led people into a relationship with Christ; (c) spent time visiting parishioners in institutional settings and in their homes as well; (d) demonstrated love and concern for all parishioners entrusted to their care; (e) encouraged parishioners to accept leadership responsibilities and assisted them in providing ministry to persons in need; (f) prayed with and for their parishioners; (g) resolved misunderstandings; (h) encouraged members to call whenever they felt it was necessary; (i) made remarks that were appropriate for the particular occasion; (j) were understanding and provided guidance, which encouraged new persons to join the church.

Effective preachers: (a) planned their sermons and accompanying hymns in advance of the worship service; (b) delivered their sermons with a great depth of commitment, boldness, and honesty; (c) guarded the sermon time in order for it to be adequate and communicated a message relevant to the listeners' needs; (d) designed their sermons so they answered children's questions.

Effective priests: (a) explained the meaning of the church's rituals; (b) made the reception of new members into the church a significant experience for each person who joined; (c) were involved totally in the worship service

through sharing their talents in various ways; (d) encouraged and prepared the congregation to learn new hymns.

Effective teachers: (a) involved themselves in reading, researching, and sharing ideas with their congregation; (b) inspired and motivated the development of leaders in the church; (c) spent time instructing and preparing their congregation to receive new programs before the programs were incorporated in the church's ministry; (d) used extreme caution when sharing controversial subjects, such as the theory of evolution, with children.

The Reactor category was concerned with behaviors that might be viewed as inappropriate for pastors to display. Analysis of this category revealed further effective pastors: (a) were consistent in word and action; (b) maintained flexibility in their thinking and encouraged new ideas from parishioners; (c) protected themselves in terms of their own mental and physical health needs; (d) sought personal counseling when situations demanding it arose.

Although Cochran's (1982) findings appear somewhat commonsensible, they can also serve as a beginning point for more specific research. His findings should be further expanded upon, which would greatly enhance the utilization of this piece of research.

Moy and Malony (1985) surveyed 98 active pastors pursuing their Doctorate of Ministry at Fuller Theological Seminary to examine leadership style and effectiveness. The pastors rated themselves simultaneously on two

leadership instruments, the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) and Life Orientation Survey (LIFO), and the effectiveness measures MEI and MFS (described previously). The LPC assesses leaders as either "task oriented" or "relationally oriented." The LIFO has four dimensions as briefly described here: (a) the "support-giving" style values quality rather than quantity, is vision-minded, keeps goals in focus, seeks cooperation, and does what is right and just; (b) the "adaptive-dealing" style is flexible, facilitates others, and considers group feelings; (c) the "controlling-taking" style sees tasks as urgent, is willing to confront others, and is able to tolerate tension in difficult situations; (d) the "conserving-holding" style proceeds with caution and precision and remains calm in crisis.

A correlational analysis revealed that the leadership style, supporting-giving, was positively correlated with the following MEI scales: openness and affirmation ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), caring ($r = .34$, $p < .01$), worship development ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), and total effectiveness ($r = .23$, $p < .01$). Regarding the leadership functions of the MFS, the supporting-giving style positively correlated with preacher ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), community involvement ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), visitor-counselor ($r = .20$, $p < .05$), and total effectiveness ($r = .22$, $p < .05$), but negatively correlated with administration ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$).

The adaptive-dealing style negatively correlated with the MEI on total effectiveness ($r = -.30$, $p < .01$), congregational leadership ($r = -.26$, $p < .01$), theologian ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$), worship ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$), and less personal

disqualifiers (r = -.28, p < .01). The adaptive-dealing style was also negatively correlated with the MFS scale, administration (r = -.18, p < .05).

Controlling-taking positively correlated with the MEI's congregational leadership (r = .23, p < .01) and negatively with being caring (r = -.18, p < .05). It was also negatively correlated with the MFS scales community involvement and visitor-counselor (r = -.24, p < .01; r = -.18, p < .05, respectively). Moy and Malony (1985) did not discuss any significant findings regarding the conserving-holding style.

Additionally, Moy and Malony (1985) assessed the test-retest reliability of the LIFO. Of the 98 subjects studied, 64 had previously completed the LIFO. Various intervals had passed since the subjects originally took the LIFO and the retesting. The authors categorized the retest intervals into the following groups: within 1 month, between 2 and 12 months, 2 years later, and 3 to 4 years later. Retest coefficients ranged from .46 to .90 for the scales retested within 12 months. The retest coefficients dropped dramatically, however, for retest intervals of 2 years or more. The authors offer two explanations: (a) subjects tested after 2 years had received LIFO leadership style training and (b) leadership may not be a stable trait.

In an intriguing and skillfully designed study, Butler (1994) compared 49 effective Nazarene ministers with 49 less effective ministers of the same denomination in attempt to ascertain differences regarding leadership behavior. These ministers, all of whom were males, were selected from the

5,000 Nazarene churches located in the United States. Butler used a three-tiered selection process to choose the effective ministers. Essentially, the effective pastor had to be nominated by both his District Superintendent (DS) and his colleagues. Additionally, his church had to demonstrate financial goal attainment and specific percentages of growth for three consecutive years. The less effective ministers were randomly selected from a list of ministers who were not nominated in any of the three categories.

To assess leadership roles, Butler (1994)used the Managerial Practices Survey (MPS) and the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ). The MPS yields 14 major scales: informing, planning, clarifying, consulting, inspiring, recognizing, monitoring, problem solving, supporting, team building, networking, delegating, mentoring, and rewarding. The LBQ purports to "get beyond a leader's espoused theory to his or her actual theory in use" (p. 49). It consists of 10 scales: (a) focused leadership, (b) communication leadership, (c) trust leadership, (d) respectful leadership, (e) risk leadership, (f) bottom-line leadership, (g) empowered leadership, (h) long-term leadership, (i) organizational leadership, and (j) cultural leadership. These measures were completed by four lay leaders in each congregation. Each pastor also completed a "self" version of the LBQ. To measure effectiveness, Butler used the MEI. He also devised an MEI "self" version for the pastor to complete by personalizing the items.

Butler (1994) compared the demographics of the effective and less

effective groups in an attempt to discover how age, years of experience, number of pastorates, number of years in current pastorate, size of church, and education level might be associated with effectiveness. A significant difference at the .05 level was noted between the two groups for size of congregation and education level.

The results of the MPS revealed that the effective group scored higher than the less effective group on all but one (teambuilder) of the scales. Three scales (problem solver, planner, and delegator) revealed significant differences at the .05 level. The problem solving factor revealed that the effective minister is "confident, decisive, takes initiative, and identifies constraints which prevent solutions" when handling church-related problems. The effective planner identifies the "details and resources" necessary to reach goals. Furthermore, they prioritizes and seeks the resources to accomplish the task. Lastly, the delegator entrusts his laity with the responsibility of determining specific actions and the necessary steps for implementing them. They delegate authority regarding important decisions, but can also be persuasive to gain support for their proposed projects.

Butler conducted a principle axis factor analysis, using a varimax rotation, of the LBQ-Other, which revealed three factors, named according to their item content. Two of the factors, "Change Agent" and "Shepherd," revealed a significant difference between the effective and less effective groups at the .05 level. Change agent denotes a minister who believes and

demonstrates that they can help the church by assisting them in adapting to changes and in the attaining of their goals. They also help to coordinates the church work activities. The shepherd cares about others, follows through with commitments, and is dependable. Although the LBQ-Self did not correlate with the LBQ-Other, it was able to significantly ($p < .05$) differentiate between the effective and less effective ministers, which indicates that the pastors perceived themselves in a way consistent with the criteria for effectiveness in this study.

As with the LBQ, Butler (1994) conducted a factor analysis of the MEI-Other to determine the underlying structure of the scale. He found four factors named according to item content: "juggler, student, servant, and person of integrity." Each of these scales revealed a significant difference between the effective and less effective ministers at the .05 level. The juggler is seen as "a flexible, trusting, facilitative, and responsible leader" (p. 133). Administratively, he shares leadership and seeks to build cooperation within the community. The student is one who pursues "lifelong learning, reflects a deep personal faith commitment" (p. 134) and builds his ministry upon Scriptural support. The servant is concerned with others more than self and is not sexist, pessimistic, condescending, or dominating. The person of integrity "does not have a self-serving ministry characterized by irresponsibility" (p. 134) nor does he engage in illicit sexual activity, gambling, or excessive smoking and drinking. The MEI-Self did not reveal any significant differences.

In Stewart's (1990) previously discussed study, he hypothesized that "highly desirable personal characteristics," as indicated by scores from the Profile of Ministry Casebook (POM), would be related to effectiveness. Although his personality, motivational, and leadership hypotheses were not supported, there were numerous significant findings for the POM. The following scales were negatively correlated with effectiveness: Self-Serving Behavior ($r = -.34$, $p = < .01$ and $r = -.27$, $p = < .05$, on MTR and IEF, respectively), Concern for Oppressed ($r = -.31$, $p = < .05$ and $r = -.26$, $p = < .05$, on MTR and IEF, respectively), Pastoral Service to All ($r = -.28$, $p = < .05$ and $r = -.34$, $p = < .01$, on MTR and IEF, respectively), Conflict Utilization ($r = -.27$, $p = < .05$ and $r = -.33$, $p = < .01$, on MTR and IEF, respectively), Law Orientation to Ethics ($r = -.23$, $p = < .05$, on MTR), Aggressive Political Action ($r = -.29$, $p = < .05$, on IEF), and Openness to Other Faiths ($r = -.27$, $p = < .05$, on IEF). Positive correlations were found between the IEF scales Personal Responsibility ($r = .32$, $p = < .05$) and Concentration on Congregational Concerns ($r = .32$, $p = < .05$).

The results indicate that the POM characteristics accounted for nearly twice as much variance on the MTR than did the other measures (POM = 27%, TSI = 14%, 16PF = 15%). On the IEF, it accounted for most of the variance ($R^2 = .41$). Specific POM characteristics that were highly associated with effectiveness were "being responsible to honor commitments" and "a lack of self-serving behavior." Moreover, a reluctance to place work commitments

ahead of family commitments differentiated between high and low interns. Stewart (1990) concluded, "The results strongly suggest that assessment should concentrate on attitudes and behaviors related to the actual conduct of ministry," rather than personality variables (p. 23).

Leadership Skills

Nauss (1989) hypothesized that ministerial effectiveness would not only be correlated with specific leadership skills, but also that each ministerial function would require a different set of leadership skills. In an attempt to assess his hypotheses, Nauss used the following Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) ministers as his subjects: 87 Iowa West District clergy, 91 California-Nevada-Hawaii District clergy, and 132 clergy from the Southern California District.

For each minister, the parish office holders--the presidents of the women's group, youth group, and congregation; the Sunday School superintendent; the parochial school principal; and the chairpersons of the elders, education, and stewardship boards--were asked to fill out the Ministerial Function Scale (MFS), used as criterion for effectiveness, and the Ohio State Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which served as the predictor variable. The MFS was previously described in this review and the LBDQ will be explained shortly. The pastor also completed a short battery which was comprised of the MFS, the LBDQ, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and a survey of his perceptions regarding the importance of seven

parish functions, leadership behaviors, and the leaders of his parish.

The lay respondents also assessed their pastors on the LBDQ, which is comprised of 11 subscales: (a) "Persuasive" is convincing and inspirational in public speaking; (b) "Assertive in Leading" takes charge in directing the congregation; (c) "Relations-oriented" shows concern for individual members of the congregation; (d) "Task-oriented" deliberately carries out specific tasks and responsibilities; (e) "Cool under Pressure" handles complex problems efficiently and calmly; (f) "Integrative" keeps the congregation working together as a group; (g) "Goal-oriented" promotes enthusiasm, urges members to work toward certain goals and to improve their performance; (h) "Accurate in Predicting" potential problems and opportunities; (i) "Tolerant of Freedom" respects an individual's right to his or her own decisions; (j) "Tolerant of Uncertainty" is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety; (k) "Representing the Congregation" speaks and acts as the representative of the congregation.

A multiple regression analysis revealed that, of the 50 effectiveness predictors, 30 were leadership behaviors. This finding affirms Nauss' (1989) first hypothesis that "specific leadership skills would be associated with effectiveness" The Preacher-Priest function was predicted solely by leadership behaviors: Persuasive (22.3%), Integrative (13.9%), Cool under pressure (9.7%), Relations-oriented (7.5%), and Representing Congregation (5.6%). The role of Administrator was predicted by the leadership behaviors Accurate

in Predicting (17.3%), Task-oriented (14.4%), Cool Under Pressure (11.1%), Integrative (8.6%), and Representing Congregation (6.5%). The Community and Social Involvement factor is comprised of two leadership behaviors: Representing Congregation (15.9%) and Relations-oriented (12.2%). Also predictive was the variable regarding the pastor's felt import with community involvement (10.8%).

The ministerial function of Personal and Spiritual Model was predicted by the following leadership skills: Cool Under Pressure (26.1%), Task-oriented (22.2%), and Relations-oriented (-7.9%). Also predictive was the degree to which the pastor valued serving as a personal and spiritual model. The effective Visitor Counselor was predicted by the leadership behaviors: Integrative (25.9%), Relations-oriented (15.1%), Persuasive (12.3%), and Goal-oriented (11.4%). An effective Teacher is characterized by being Relations-oriented (16.2%) and Goal-oriented (2.8%). The extent that they value their role as Teacher (15.0%) and age (5.2%) were also predictive. The successful Evangelist is Goal-oriented (27.9%), Relations Oriented (9.6%), and Persuasive (7.2%). The importance they place on the roles of Evangelist (10.2%) is also predictive. The Overall Effective minister is Integrative (19.7%), Cool Under Pressure (15.5%), Goal-oriented (15.0%), Relations-oriented (13.7%), Persuasive (11.4%), Controlling (-8.3%), and Representing the Congregation (6.2%).

A close examination of the results supports the second hypothesis that

effectiveness in the separate ministerial functions would be characterized by different sets and amounts of the skills. Although many of the skills remain predictive across ministerial functions, it is important to note that they are present in varying amounts and they group differently on each function. The leadership skills in this study were better predictors of success than the other factors.

Building on this study, Nauss (1994) attempted to use leadership skills to predict the effectiveness of ministerial functions by using an expanded version of the dated MFS, the Ministerial Activity Scale (MAS; an additional 16 items were added). The functions of the MAS are essentially the same with a few additions: the "Equipper" function includes recruiting, training and assisting lay leaders, and the "Personal Enabler" function combines many of the other functions in a personal manner. It includes maintaining harmony, handling troublemakers, and averting or resolving problems. Lastly, the original "Teacher" function was divided into two functions: "Teacher," which includes teaching and stimulating discussions with adults and youth and "Minister to Youth and Children," which includes teaching and working directly with children and youth while helping to identify their goals and evaluate their adequacies.

Nauss (1994) assessed the effectiveness and leadership skills of 421 Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) ministers by sending the MAS and the LBDQ to lay leaders in each church. Results indicated good reliability,

similar to his 1989 study. Furthermore, he was able to establish the key leadership roles integral to the new functions. Using a multiple regression analysis, Nauss found the following amounts of variance of ministerial functions predicted by the reported leadership skills (only results reaching a probability level of .05 reported): The Preacher/Priest is Persuasive (.78) and Cool Under Pressure (.11), but he is not Task-Oriented (-.17) nor Tolerant of Freedom (-.07). The Administrator is Cool Under Pressure (.38), Accurate in Predicting (.33), Task-Oriented (.23), Integrative (.15), and Represents Congregation (.11), but is not Persuasive (-.25) nor Tolerant of Freedom (-.10). The Personal/Spiritual Model is Cool Under Pressure (.25), Persuasive (.22), Task Oriented (.22), and Tolerant of Uncertainty (.16). The Visitor/Counselor is Relations oriented (.32), Integrative (.28), Goal oriented (.18), and Persuasive (.18). The Community-Minded minister Represents the congregation (.38), is Relations oriented (.31), Task-oriented (.27), and Accurate in Predicting (.25).

The Minister to Youth and Children is Relations-oriented (.50), Goal-oriented (.14), and Persuasive (.12). The Teacher is Persuasive (.47), Goal-oriented (.20), Relations-oriented (.16), and Cool Under Pressure (.13). The Evangelist is Goal-oriented (.57), Accurate in Predicting (.25), and Tolerant of uncertainty (.08). The Equipper is Relations oriented (.25), Goal-oriented (.19), Cool under pressure (.17), Task-oriented (.17), Accurate in Predicting (.16), and Integrative (.16).The Personal Enabler is Relations-oriented (.30), Goal-oriented (.27), Integrative (.25), Accurate in Predicting (.15), Persuasive (.11),

and Tolerant of Freedom (.07).

Nauss' (1989, 1994) early research clarifies that different patterns of leadership skills are required by effective ministers according to each specific ministry function. In his most recent work (Nauss, 1995), he added the variable of "congregation size" to the data from the aforementioned study in an attempt to ascertain how various church sizes might also impact the patterns of leadership skills required for effectiveness in each function. He categorized the churches into five sizes: (a) ≥99, (b) 100-249, (c) 250-499 (d) 500-799, and (e) 800 and above.

Nauss (1995) generated interesting results regarding the specific leadership skills across the 10 functions for the five church sizes. Unfortunately, however, the results are too lengthy to be described here in detail. A synopsis of his findings will be explained here by reporting the findings regarding the Visitor/Counselor function.

In churches smaller than 100 members, the effective Visitor/Counselor is Persuasive and Representative of the Congregation (.26 and .28, $p < .05$, respectively). With congregations of 100-249, being Relations-Oriented, Goal-Oriented, Persuasive, and Integrative are all important functions for the effective Visitor/Counselor (.26, .19, .20, .36, $p < .05$, respectively). In churches of 250-499 members, being Relations-Oriented and Integrative are again predictive (.29 and .32, $p < .05$, respectively). With congregations of 500-799, effective Visitor/Counselors must be Relations-Oriented and Goal-Oriented

(.60 and .34, $p < .05$, respectively) whereas in larger congregations, the minister is Relations-Oriented and Representative of the Congregation (.58 and .30, $p < .05$, respectively). Nauss' (1995) results can be examined in complete detail by reviewing his article, titled "The Pastor as Leader: Shepherd, Rancher, or...?" Across the five size groups, Nauss found leadership skills to account for nearly 3/4 of the variance in effectiveness ratings.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) comparing the leadership skills across size and function revealed that 5 of the 11 leadership skills were rated differently because of the main effect of size: Representing Congregation ($p < .01$), Tolerant of Uncertainty ($p < .05$), Assertive in Leading ($p < .001$), Goal-Oriented ($p < .01$), and Cool under Pressure ($p < .01$). Eight of the leadership skills were rated differentially based on function: Representing Congregation ($p < .01$), Tolerant of Freedom ($p < .05$), Persuasive ($p < .001$), Task-Oriented ($p < .001$), Relations-Oriented ($p < .001$), Goal-Oriented ($p < .01$), Accurate in Predicting ($p < .05$), and Integrative ($p < .05$). All of the leadership skills, with the sole exception of Tolerant of Uncertainty, were rated significantly different, at either the .01 or .001 level, because of the interaction effect.

A factor analysis of the 11 leadership skills yielded three factors named on the basis of item content: Intentional Ministry, Participative, and Representing Congregation. The Intentional Ministry factor is comprised of seven leadership skills: Persuasive, Task-Oriented, Assertive in Leading, Goal-

Oriented, Accurate in Predicting, Cool under Pressure, and Integrative. Three leadership skills comprise the Participative factor: Tolerant of Uncertainty, Tolerant of Freedom, and Relations-Oriented. Lastly, the leadership skill, Representing Congregation, forms a factor by itself, named the Representing Congregation factor. A multiple regression with these three skill factors and the 10 functions seems to indicate that the intentional and participative skills are typically used in conjunction with each other.

Likewise, a factor analysis of the 10 ministerial functions also revealed three factors: (a) "Traditional" factor is comprised of priest/preacher, teacher, personal model, and visitor/counselor functions; (b) the "Neo-traditional" factor is made up of the youth/childrens' minister and community-minded minister functions; (c) the "Contemporary" factor combines the personal enabler, administrator, equipper, and evangelist functions.

Summary of Leadership Styles and Behaviors and Leadership Skills

Cochran (1982) gathered numerous leadership behaviors that characterize effective ministry of the following functions: administration, organization, pastoring, preaching, being a priest, teaching, and avoiding inappropriate behaviors. Moy and Malony (1985) compared the leadership styles of support-giving, controlling-taking, conserving-holding, and adaptive-dealing, with effectiveness. They found support-giving to be positively correlated with openness and affirmation, caring, worship development and the functions of preacher, community involvement, and visitor-counselor and

negatively correlated with administration. The adaptive-dealing style negatively correlated with congregational leadership, theologian, worship, less personal disqualifiers, and the administration function. Controlling-taking positively correlated with congregational leadership, but negatively with being caring and the functions of community involvement and visitor-counselor. They also found the reliability of the LIFO to be adequate if retested within 1 year. Thereafter, the LIFO's reliability drops dramatically.

Butler (1994) found effective ministers to be significantly more confident, decisive, solution oriented, able to prioritize, and comfortable with delegating responsibility. Furthermore, they are dependable, follow through with commitments and believe themselves to be agents of change. Lastly, the effective minister is a lifelong student, a person of integrity, a flexible and responsible leader, and a servant at heart.

Stewart (1990) concluded that attitudes and behaviors related to ministry are better predictors of success than personal motivations or personality. The Profile of Ministry Casebook (POM) revealed significant correlations with ministerial effectiveness and accounted for nearly twice the variance on the effectiveness measure than did the motivation or personality measures. Several POM characteristics that correlated with effectiveness were a lack of self-serving behavior and being responsible to honor commitments.

Nauss (1989) found leadership skills to be better predictors of ministerial effectiveness than personality. Effectiveness in each of the eight

ministerial functions was predicted by varying sets and balances of the leadership skills. In his 1994 study, Nauss hoped to expand the ministerial functions of the dated MFS. By adding additional items, his research yielded three new ministerial functions, Equipper, Personal Enabler, and Minister to Youth/Children. Once again, Nauss found leadership skills to predict ministerial effectiveness across the various functions.

Nauss's 1995 study added the variable of congregation size to his 1994 study. He found the predictive leadership skills to vary across church sizes. Factor analysis of the leadership skills yielded three predictive factors: Intentional Ministry, Participative, and Representing Congregation. Factor analysis of the ministerial functions also yielded three factors: Traditional, Neo-traditional, and Contemporary functions.

Interpersonal Characteristics and Perceptions

Ross (1987), troubled by Malony's and Majovski's (1986) findings of a lack of relationship between ministers' self-ratings of effectiveness and the ratings given by the DS or parishioners, set out to measure whether ministerial intern's self-ratings would also significantly differ from their supervisors' and lay persons' ratings. Based on Luckey's (1960) findings that communication and interpersonal relations are more satisfactory when individuals perceive similarly, Ross also hypothesized that closer matches between self- and other ratings would be correlated with higher levels of interpersonal responsiveness

within the interns.

Ross (1987) used 186 Methodist interns enrolled in their first year-long internship at the seminary. The Evaluation - Feedback for Ministry Form (EFMF) was completed by the intern, their pastoral supervisor, and a committee of parishioners from their placement. The EFMF is a 5-point Likert scale divided into four sections: (a) style of church leadership, (b) personal characteristics, (c) functions of ministry, and (d) theologian in life and thought.

Results revealed that although the interns' self-ratings correlated significantly with the parishioner-ratings on only one item, mutuality in family commitments (.638), the interns' ratings correlated significantly with supervisor-ratings on five variables: community building (.379), mutuality in family commitments (.659), sharing congregational leadership (.192), denominational loyalty (.219), and intelligence demonstrated in communication (.237). The supervisor and parishioner ratings correlated on four variables: positive approach (.250), mutuality in family commitments (.658), sharing congregational leadership (.314), and intelligence demonstrated in communication (.202). A post hoc comparison (Tukey) revealed that the parishioners ratings were significantly higher than the supervisors' or the interns' ratings. No significant difference was evident between the supervisors' ratings and those of the interns.

In addition to these findings, Ross (1987) wanted to assess whether higher levels of "interpersonal responsiveness" of interns would correlate with

more similar effectiveness ratings between the intern, the supervisors, and the parishioners. Ross defined interpersonal responsiveness as high scores on three items derived from the EFMF: teachability, self-candidness, and ability to relate. Contrary to his prediction, Ross found that the more discrepancy between the interns' self-ratings of effectiveness and the supervisors' and parishioners' ratings of effectiveness, the higher the intern rated on interpersonal responsiveness. Further inquiry allowed Ross to assess whether interns underrated or overrated their effectiveness. Results revealed significant negative correlations ($p < .01$). That is, as interns rated themselves as more effective, they received lower ratings by supervisors and parishioners on interpersonal responsiveness. When interns underrated themselves, they received higher ratings on interpersonal responsiveness. Ross concluded that it follows logically that supervisors and parishioners would give higher ratings on two of the interpersonal responsiveness variables (teachability and self-candidness) to interns who underrated themselves.

Boersma (1988) compared the perceptions of ministers, lay leaders, and seminary faculty regarding managerial skills required of ministers administering effective church management. He was particularly interested in comparing the seminary faculty, "those responsible for the design and implementation of pastoral training curricula" and church laity, "those most influential in assessing the performance of pastors" (Boersma, 1988, p. 5).

Boersma (1988) developed a 50-item, Likert-type scale that required

the respondent to judge the relative importance of each competency in pastoral ministry. He administered this questionnaire to his sample of 200 ministers, 142 lay leaders, and 170 seminary faculty. The subjects were randomly selected from the Conservative Baptist Association of America (CBA), the Independent Fundamental Churches of America (IFCA), and, in the case of the seminaries, those who had similar doctrinal statements indicating a conservative theological position. The faculty were further divided into four sub-groups: (a) content instructors teaching systematic theology, Old and New Testament languages and literature, biblical studies, and historical theology; (b) practical instructors of pastoral ministry, Christian education, communications, counseling/pastoral psychology, church music, and mission/evangelism; (c) faculty who had previously pastored full-time; and (d) faculty without full-time pastoral experience.

When factor analyzed, the 50 competency items revealed three factors with corresponding first-order factors. Factor I, Implementing and Decision-Making, is comprised of three first-order factors, staffing, directing, and controlling. This factor received the highest mean score (4.53), indicating that the respondents considered it vital in seminary training. Factor II, Interpersonal Skills, carried a mean score of 4.36 and is therefore also considered by the respondents to be crucial in ministerial preparation. Lastly, Factor III, Pathfinding, along with the first-order factors strategic pathfinding and operational pathfinding received an average mean of 3.95 and thus

should receive some emphasis in seminary.

Of the 50 competencies, the faculty and pastors significantly differed at the .05 level regarding their perceptions of 15 competencies. The faculty placed more emphasis on strategic pathfinding, which is comprised of the following items: develop a staffing plan, complete a needs assessment, oversee program development, and write specific, measurable goals and objectives. Regarding operational pathfinding, the faculty considered it more important than did the pastors to develop an organization chart, match structure with the strategic plan, develop an effective management information system, and develop evaluation standards to match the church's management plan. Faculty also placed greater importance than the ministers on interpersonal skills: the ability to delegate effectively with staff and leadership, make use of effective communication skills in directing the work of staff and membership, foster independent thought, build and maintain staff morale, and develop effective evaluation standards for use with staff. Lastly, faculty felt it more important than the pastors both to involve existing staff and leadership in the process of developing the mission statement and to carry on a regular evaluation program to provide ongoing feedback on all major areas of activity in the church. In sum, faculty placed more emphasis than pastors on "the need for planning, establishing and using effective evaluation methods and techniques to monitor the activities of staff and programs" (Boersma, 1988, p. 101).

Both faculty and lay leaders emphasized the areas of strategic and operational planning. When compared to lay leaders, the faculty rated as more important the pastors' involvement in the area of human resource planning. Significant differences were also noted between the faculty and lay leaders regarding interpersonal skills, with faculty rating the pastor's ability to do the following as more important: delegate effectively, modify positions to fit existing staff, manage conflict, create an environment where independent thought is encouraged, build and maintain staff morale, and develop effective evaluation standards for use with staff.

When the lay leaders and pastors were compared, it was noted that lay leaders considered it significantly more important (at the .05 level) for pastors to develop a church-wide organizational chart, identify issues that could affect the church's ability to reach stated goals, and conduct a needs assessment. Pastors rated as more important, however, their need to budget the allocation of resources, develop and maintain specific job descriptions for staff and leadership positions, and modify individual positions to fit existing staff capabilities.

Boersma (1988) also hoped to determine whether practical church experience would influence faculty's perceptions of importance for the 50 managerial competencies. His findings suggest that there is not a significant difference in faculty's perceptions based upon previous pastoral experience. Regarding discrepancies between faculty teaching practical disciplines and

those teaching content disciplines, Boersma did find 28 significant discrepancies, although no specific patterns of disagreement were noted. Although numerous differences existed, it is important to note both groups rated all of the competencies as minimally "important."

One of the more critical interpersonal roles a pastor fills is that of counselor. Gary Collins (1988) quoted Wayne Oates stating, "The pastor, regardless of his training, does not enjoy the privilege of electing whether or not he will counsel with his people. They inevitably bring their problems to him" (p. 15). Jansen, Bonk, and Garvey (1973) hoped to determine whether the MMPI could predict the specific function of counseling effectiveness with ministers. They used 85 clergymen who completed a counseling training program at Willmar State Hospital. The mean age of these men was 33.3 years and their mean Shipley-Hartford IQ was 117.3. Eighty percent of these men were Catholic and 20% were Protestant. Each subject completed the MMPI during their first week of training. During the last week of training, supervisors and peers were instructed to rank each student from first to last on the basis of counseling effectiveness.

A correlation of .64 was noted between supervisors' and peers' ratings of competence. The Paranoia scale was the best (negative) predictor of both supervisors' and peers' ratings (r = -.44 and r = -.46, respectively). The Depression and Psychasthenia scales were also negatively correlated with the supervisors' ratings (r = -.40 and r = -.33, respectively). Regarding peer ratings

of counseling effectiveness, Schizophrenia, Psychasthenia, Depression, Psychopathic Deviate, Hysteria, and K-Correction were also negatively correlated (r = -.39, r = -.37, r = -.35, r = -.33, r = -.31 and r = -.30, respectively).

Summary of Interpersonal Characteristics and Perceptions

Ross (1987) found few significant correlations between ministers' self-ratings and parishioner-ratings as the parishioners' ratings tended to be higher than either the minister's or the supervisor's. Ross did not find support for his hypothesis that self- and other ratings would correlate with higher levels of interpersonal responsiveness as defined by the minister's teachability, self-candidness, and ability to relate.

Boersma (1988) found numerous discrepancies between seminary faculty, ministers, and laity regarding effective management competencies. Most notable was that faculty placed greater emphasis than did pastors on the need for planning and evaluation methods. Although Boersma did not find significant discrepancies between the perceptions of faculty with and without practical experience, he did find significant discrepancies between faculty teaching content disciplines and those teaching the practical disciplines.

Discussion

Since Christ's ministry, the church has attempted to identify and train those called to the ministry. Over the last 4 decades, the church has also become increasingly interested in gaining insight into those variables comprising an effective minister. They have enlisted the help of psychologists to assist in (a) defining the parameters of effectiveness, and (b) developing corresponding assessment tools. This quest, however, remains in its infancy. With the exception of a few areas, the research on ministerial effectiveness is scattered and disjointed, and few studies build upon previous findings. There is a great need for more research and understanding of this area if we desire more developed and better equipped ministers to assist in the spiritual formation of the new millennium.

In some ways, the research reviewed here provides a firm landing from which future explorations can be launched. For instance, we now know that special personality norms are warranted when evaluating ministers. We can infer that our society values high energy, intelligence, and tangible results, such as an increase in numbers, when dealing with ministers. It appears that those ministers who evidence higher levels of emotional adjustment are viewed as more effective. It is also evident that "effectiveness" is too broad and needs to be studied in the context of various roles/functions. Lastly, effective ministers tend to possess a variety of leadership skills, are highly motivated, and have a similar world-view as their congregations. These

findings are important and they help shape our future investigations, but the exploration must continue, and in some new ways.

A number of problems and limitations are evident in the literature on ministerial effectiveness. Progress is constantly rebuffed by researchers' inability to agree upon a viable operational definition of effectiveness. Equating ministerial effectiveness to academic success in graduate school is no longer acceptable. Although the perceptions of peers and supervisors are a preferred method of measuring effectiveness, their impressions, as evidenced by Kierkegaard's words, are subject to superficial influences. In an attempt to capture effectiveness, numerous measures have been constructed, but they vary in psychometric sophistication. One measure frequently used as a criterion for effectiveness, the MEI, actually measures several personality traits. It would make more sense then, to use the MEI as a predictor of effectiveness, rather than a criterion for it. Furthermore, comparing and understanding the practical meaning of the results from these measures is often difficult. These criticisms are accompanied with no small amount of humility as easy answers appear unavailable. As suggested by Dittes (1962), it may be that empirical researchers are too far removed from their theoretical counterparts and visa versa. Ideally, researchers, theoreticians, and pastor/theologians would creatively and respectfully collaborate.

Future research on ministerial effectiveness should address several areas. First, methodological and measurement issues need to be addressed.

Instruments measuring effectiveness need to be standardized and used across studies to increase our ability to compare results across studies. As noted above, future research should study effectiveness in the context of specific pastoral roles and functions, rather than as a general construct. In order to facilitate comparison across studies, it would be helpful for studies to define and measure the various role/functions of the pastorate in a consistent manner.

Second, given the present finding that overall emotional adjustment is related to increased effectiveness, the relationship between the spiritual/emotional development of ministers and their effectiveness should be investigated. Our ideas of effectiveness may have removed our ministers from the earthy spirituality of Jesus Christ. It is important to remember that Christ placed ultimate value on the condition of one's heart. It follows, then, that an effective minister's personal spiritual development, as well as his/her ability to assist others in the spiritual development of their inner being, would be of ultimate import. Studies examining ministers' spiritual development in general (Hall, 1997) and spiritual development in relation to ministerial effectiveness are conspicuously lacking.

Third, investigating the relationship between ministers' goals and strivings and their effectiveness would be highly informative. Emmons (1999) has made a strong case for the importance of goals and strivings in predicting important outcomes such as effectiveness and subjective well-being. He builds on McAdams' (1996) three-levelmodel of personality which includes (a)

dispositional traits, (b) contextualized personal concerns, and (c) integrative life stories. Level I, or traits describe the most general behavior patterns that have been referred to as "basic tendencies." Though important, pastors cannot be reduced to traits. Decontextualized traits are insufficient to fully understand important outcome variables like subjective well-being and effectiveness. Level II includes contextualized strategies, plans, and concerns that enable a person to achieve important life goals (Emmons, 1999). These constructs involve intentionality and goal directedness rather than habitual tendencies.

Many of the measures used to predict ministerial effectiveness tap level I trait constructs. Level II constructs--goals and strivings--would likely provide substantial insight into ministerial effectiveness. An example of one hypothesis is that goal coherence would likely predict increased effectiveness among pastors.

In conclusion, effective ministry does not appear reducible to personality traits, nor to mere patterns of motivation, leadership ability, or interpersonal relations. Although these components may account for considerable variance in effectiveness, we must not miss the very stuff of a minister's existence and person. Ministers are not static beings, but rather men and women with stories who are in the process of becoming. This makes the task of understanding and promoting ministerial effectiveness all the more challenging. It is hoped that reviewing this literature will stimulate further

progress toward this end, which is crucial to the well-being of the Church.

REFERENCES

Boersma, S. A. (1988). Managerial competencies for church administration as perceived by seminary faculties, church lay leaders, and ministers (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Corvallis, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50 (01), 195A.

Butler, D. M. (1994). Effective pastoral leadership: A study of ministers within the Church of the Nazarene (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56 (01), 41A.

Cardwell, S. W. (1967). The MMPI as a predictor of success among seminary students. Ministry Studies, 1, 3-20.

Cardwell, S. W. (1982). Why women fail/succeed in ministry: Psychological factors. Pastoral Psychology, 30, 153-162.

Cochran, J. D. (1982). A study to identify critical elements associated with effective and ineffective behaviors of United Methodist ministers in performance of the pastoral ministry (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Ann Arbor, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43 (02), 398A.

Collins, G. (1988). Christian counseling: A comprehensive guide. Dallas: Word Publishing.

Dittes, J. E. (1962). Research on clergymen. Religious Education, 4 (Research Supplement), 141-165.

Emmons, R. A. (1999). The psychology of ultimate concerns. New York: Guilford Press.

Hall, T. W. (1997). The personal functioning of pastors: A review of empirical research with implications for the care of pastors. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 25, 240-253.

Jansen, D., Bonk, E., & Garvey, F. (1973). MMPI characteristics of clergymen in counseling training and their relationship to supervisors' and peers' ratings of counseling effectiveness. Psychological Reports, 33, 695-698.

Kling, F. R. (1958). A study of testing as related to the ministry. Religious Education, 53, 243-248.

Lichtman, S. L. (1989). Ministerial effectiveness as a function of personal preferences and job expectancies (Doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50 (10), 4775B.

Luckey, E. (1960). Marital satisfaction and congruent self-spouse concepts. Social Forces, 39, 153-157.

McAdams, D.P. (1996). Personality, modernity, and the storied self: A contemporary framework for studying persons. Psychological Inquiry, 7, 295-321.

Malony, H. N., & Majovski, L. F. (1986). The role of psychological assessment in predicting ministerial effectiveness. Review of Religious Research, 28, 29-39.

Moy, A. (1985). The relationship between leadership and ministerial effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.

Nauss, A. (1972). Problems in measuring ministerial effectiveness. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 141-151.

Nauss, A. (1983). Seven profiles of effective ministry. Review of Religious Research, 24, 334-346.

Nauss, A. (1989). Leadership styles of effective ministry. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 17, 59-67.

Nauss, A. (1994). Ministerial effectiveness in ten functions. Review of Religious Research, 36, 58-69.

Nauss, A. (1995). The pastor as leader: Shepherd, rancher, or...? Journal of Psychology and Theology, 23, 115-128.

Ross, D. (1987). Similarity among ratings of ministerial effectiveness and its relationship to interpersonal responsiveness (Doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49 (04), 844A.

Schuller, D.S., Strommen, M.P., & Brekke, M.L. (1980). Ministry in America. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Stewart, J. C. (1990). Validation of a multi-dimensional assessment battery for ministerial candidates (Doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, 1990). Dissertatión Abstracts International, 51 (07), 143B.